



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/987,418	11/14/2001	Ryu Inada	111121	7037
25944	7590	01/10/2005	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			VU, THONG H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/987,418

Applicant(s)

INADA ET AL.

Examiner

Thong H Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8-11,15-18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-6,8-11,15-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

1. Amended claims 1,4,5,8,15-18,19 and new claim 20 are pending.
2. Claims 3,7,12-14 and 19 are canceled. Claims 1,4,5,8,15-18 have been amended. Thus the Final rejection is appropriate.
3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 8-10 filed 10/18/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-19 under Davis-Dustan are been fully considered and are persuasive. Davis-Dustan did not teach the predetermined elements includes an element allocated for representing a purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Davis-Richard.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,4,8-11,15-18,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Davis et al [Davis 6,088,805] in view of Richard et al [Richard 5,922,074].

4. As per claim 4, Davis discloses an apparatus for processing a subject name included in a personal certificate, comprising:

a part that receives a personal certificate [Davis, user identity, user certification, col 6 lines 9-46];

a part that extracts a predetermined element in a hierarchy of a subject name (i.e.: a selected data) included in the received personal certificate [Davis, filtering the selected data, col 9 lines 40-56]; and

a part that determines an access right based on a value of the predetermined element [Davis, access rights granted based upon the issuing CA, col 7 lines 45-53; predefined filter rules, col 8 lines 54-63].

However Davis does not detail the predetermined elements includes an element allocated for representing a purpose of operation (i.e.: a subject name) to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate.

Richard discloses a server determines the access rights to grant to a client [Richard, the access rights to grant to a client, col 2 lines 30-39] and a method to verify a certificate includes a validity field and subject field specifies the name of the party who holds the certificate [Richard, subject field specifies the name of the party who holds the certificate, col 7 lines 24-48]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the subject name as an element to determine the access right to the client as taught by Richard into the Davis apparatus in order to improve the security services within a network. Doing so would provide a greater control access to server resources.

5. As per claim 1, Davis-Richard disclose an apparatus (or web server) for processing a subject name included in a personal certificate [Davis, Web server, col 4 lines 29-64], comprising:

a part that receives a personal certificate (i.e.: personal ID) [Davis, user identity, user certification, col 6 lines 9-46];

a part that verifies the received personal certificate based on a digital signature technique [Davis, verify the digital signature of the holder, col 5 lines 42-55];

a part that extracts at least one of predetermined elements in a hierarchy of a subject name included in the received personal certificate [Davis, filtering the selected data, col 9 lines 40-56]; and

a part that determines an access right of holder of the personal certificate based on a value of the at least one predetermined element (i.e.: predefined filter rules) when the personal certificate is successfully verified [Davis, access rights granted based upon the issuing CA, col 7 lines 45-53; predefined filter rules, col 8 lines 54-63].

wherein the predetermined elements includes an element allocated for representing a purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate [Richard, subject field specifies the name of the party who holds the certificate, col 7 lines 24-48].

6. As per claim 2, Davis-Richard disclose the at least one of the predetermined elements is an organizational unit name of a predetermined hierarchy of the subject name [Davis, organization name, sub-fields, col 7 lines 12-30; col 9 lines 1-10].

7. Claims 15,17 contain the similar limitations set forth of apparatus claim 1.

Therefore, claims 15,17 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1.

8. As per claim 8, Davis-Richard disclose an apparatus for processing a subject name included in a personal certificate, which receives a personal certificate in which a predetermined element of a subject name represents an organization to which a holder of the certificate belongs and an attribute other than a personal ID so as to process the subject name, the apparatus comprising:

a part that receives the personal certificate [Davis, user identity, user certification, col 6 lines 9-46];

a part that extracts a predetermined element in a hierarchy of a subject name included in the received personal certificate [Davis, filtering the selected data, col 9 lines 40-56]; and

a part that determines an access right at least based on an organization to which a holder belongs and an attribute other than a personal ID represented by a value of the predetermined element [Davis, access rights granted based upon the issuing CA, col 7 lines 45-53; predefined filter rules, col 8 lines 54-63].

wherein the predetermined elements in a hierarchy of the subject name represents a purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate [Richard, subject field specifies the name of the party who holds the certificate, col 7lines 24-48].

9. As per claim 9, Davis-Richard disclose the organizational unit name of a predetermined hierarchy of the subject name represents that the holder of the certificate is not a member of an organization represented by the organization name and that the holder cooperates with the organization [Davis, organization name, sub-fields, col 7 lines 12-30; col 9 lines 1-10].

10. As per claim 10, Davis discloses the organizational unit name of a predetermined hierarchy of the subject name represents a project name in which the holder takes part.

11. As per claim 11, Davis-Richard disclose the organizational unit name of a predetermined hierarchy of the subject name represents a cooperating organization name which cooperates with an organization represented by the organization name and to which the holder belongs [Davis, organization name, sub-fields, col 7 lines 12-30; col 9 lines 1-10].

12. Claims 16,18 contain the similar limitations set forth of apparatus claim 8. Therefore, claims 16,18 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 8.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2142

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Davis et al [Davis 6,088,805] in view of Richard et al [Richard 5,922,074] and further in view of Dustan et al [Dustan 5,884,312].

14. As per claim 5, Davis discloses a web server computer system comprising:

a part that receives a personal certificate [Davis, user identity, user certification, col 6 lines 9-46];

a part that verifies the received personal certificate based on a digital signature technique [Davis, verify the digital signature, col 5 lines 42-55];

a part that extracts at least one of predetermined elements in a hierarchy of a subject name included in the received personal certificate [Davis, filtering the selected data, col 9 lines 40-56];

a part that determines an access right of a holder of the personal certificate based on a value of the at least one predetermined element when the received personal certificate is successfully verified [Davis, access rights granted based upon the issuing CA, col 7 lines 45-53; predefined filter rules, col 8 lines 54-63]; and

wherein the predetermined elements includes an element allocated for representing a purpose of operation (i.e.: a subject name) to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate [Richard, subject field specifies the name of the party who holds the certificate, col 7 lines 24-48]

However Davis does not details



a part that allocates a session identifier when the received personal certificate is successfully verified; and a part that stores the determined access right associated with the session identifier.

It was well-known in the art that a session identifier used to compared to a user access right to determine a personal access [Dustan, the session ID and rights to execute the function, col 18 lines 54-65].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the technique of determine the access right associated with the session identifier as taught by Dustan into the Davis-Richard apparatus in order to utilize the user identification or digital signature. Doing so would provide a security feature of allowing permissions and rights to be assigned to individual users or groups of users to limit access to certain data sources.

15. As per claim 6, Davis-Richard-Dustan disclose the at least one of the predetermined elements is an organizational unit name of a predetermined hierarchy of the subject name [Davis, organization name, sub-fields, col 7 lines 12-30; col 9 lines 1-10].

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2142


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Jack Harvey*, can be reached at (571) 272-3896. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Thong Vu*  
*Patent Examiner*  
*Art Unit 2142*



JOHN FOLLANSBEE  
ASSISTANT PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100